NOTE IV.

ON THE SPECIFIC DISTINCTNESS OF RHOMBORRHINA RESPLENDENS SWARTZ AND GIGANTEA KRAATZ.

BY

C. RITSEMA Cz.

In the introduction of his »Uebersicht der Cetoniden der Sunda-Inseln und Molukken" (Troschel's Archiv für Naturgeschichte. 1871. I. p. 224) Dr. Mohnike puts in question the correctness of the statement about the habitat of three *Rhomborrhina*-specimens (two from Java: Muller, and one from Sumatra: Ludeking) at that time present in the collection of the Leyden Museum, and says to be convinced of the absence of representatives of the above genus from all the Asiatic Archipelagos with the only exception of Japan. As to the habitat »Sumatra" the late Dr. Snellen van Vollenhoven has already recorded (Tijdschrift voor Entomologie. XV. 1872. p. 125) that this was not at all doubtful, having, as he said, taken himself the specimen out of Ludeking's box and placed it in the collection. Afterwards I myself could ascertain the same about the habitat »Java" having received a specimen captured by Mr. Bernelot Moens in the Preanger Districts at a height of 4 à 5000 feet above the level of the sea (Tijdschr. v. Entom. XXIII. 1880. p. xciv). Thus the presence of the genus *Rhomborrhina* in both these islands was sufficiently stated, the identification of the species, however, was erroneous. Snellen van Vollenhoven (l. c. p.

127) pertained in regarding the specimens above referred to as belonging to *resplendens* Sw., notwithstanding Mohnike (l. c.) had already expressed some doubts as to the correctness of this identification; I myself at first (l. c.) adopted Snellen van Vollenhoven's determination, but after having received a specimen of the true *resplendens*, I considered the Javan and Sumatran specimens as belonging to *heros* G. & P. (see Tijdschr. v. Entom. XXVI. 1883. p. CXLII), an identification which I now feel sure is likewise incorrect.

On page 380 of vol. XXVII (1883) of the Deutsche Entomologische Zeitschrift Dr. Kraatz describes a species of *Rhomborrhina* under the name of *gigantea* without making mention of its habitat. This species is considered by Mr. Neervoort van de Poll (Notes Leyden Museum. 1889. p. 64) to be a mere synonym of *resplendens* Sw., an assertion which is, and with reason, disapproved by Dr. Kraatz (Deuts. Entom. Zeits. 1889. p. 421) who mentions at the same time the island of Nias as the probable habitat of his species 1). Moreover Dr. Kraatz maintains Dr. Burmeister's view concerning the identity of *resplendens* Sw. and *heros* G. & P., and after a careful reexamination of the matter I fully agree with him, and have come to the conclusion that Kraatz's *Rhomborrhina gigantea* is a distinct species which occurs in Nias, West Sumatra and West Java, specimens from these three islands being present in the Leyden Museum. The specimens from Java, however, are of a more golden green colour with a more or less distinct orange yellow hue on the disc of the elytra according to the light.

In reexamining my specimens of these two species I found, besides the difference in size, shape and coloration, that in *resplendens* the front margin of the clypeus is considerably more turned upwards and that the lateral declivous portions of the clypeus are much broader than in *gigantea*;

---

1) It is, but no doubt by mistake, recorded by von Schönfeldt in his Catalogue of the Coleoptera of Japan (Jahrb. Nass. Ver. f. Naturk. XL. p. 110).

that the part of the head between the eyes is more distinctly raised along the middle in *resplendens* than in *gigantea*; that in *resplendens* the central emargination of the basal margin of the thorax (in front of the scutellum) is smaller than the lateral ones, whereas they are equal in width to each other in *gigantea*, and finally that in *resplendens* the scutellum is distinctly smaller than in *gigantea*.

Obs. The Javan Cetoniid for which Dr. Kraatz proposes (Deuts. Entom. Zeits. 1889. p. 422) the name of *Macronota rufipennis*, no doubt will prove to be one of the varieties of *Macronota scenica* G. & P. which certainly is specifically distinct from *Macronota quadrilineata* G. & P.

A few years ago Dr. Kraatz published (Deuts. Entom. Zeits. 1885. p. 80) some remarks about *Glycyphana rufo-vittata* Guérin and Wallace, and supposing that Wallace's specimens did not belong to the true *rufo-vittata* Guér., he proposed for the former species the name of *vittata*. However, four years previous to that date Mr. O. E. Janson had already changed the name *rufo-vittata* Wall. in *illusa* (Cist. Entom. II. p. 608. Febr. 1881), giving at the same time a detailed description of the species, and mentioning 11 mill. as its length. Kraatz is wrong when he says: »Dieser (Wallace) giebt seiner Art 14 mill. Länge", as nothing is said by Wallace about the size of his specimens.

In our Museum is a specimen (from Malacca) of the true *rufovittata*, which exactly corresponds to Guérin's description (Rev. Zool. 1840. p. 82) with the exception, however, of the colour of the elytra these being dull black in stead of shining dark green. As to the dirty white crust which, in my specimen, covers the entire pygidium and sides of abdomen, this no doubt is a character of the female, and consequently Guérin's specimen must be a male.